

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ROLANDO SILVA MALDONADO,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

---

Criminal Case Number 10-20607

Civil Case Number 12-12789

Honorable David M. Lawson

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

Presently before the Court is the petitioner's motion for a certificate of appealability.

The petitioner filed a motion to vacate his sentence under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 on June 25, 2012. The petition raised three claims: (1) the Court erred when it denied his motion to suppress evidence; (2) the petitioner received ineffective assistance of counsel; and (3) the guilty plea was defective because the Court did not comply with Rule 11 by not advising the petitioner of the nature of the charge. The Court filed an opinion and order on February 10, 2015 denying the petitioner's motion and entered judgment.

Pursuant to Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings, which was amended as of December 1, 2009:

The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant . . . . If the court issues a certificate, the court must state the specific issue or issues that satisfy the showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). If the court denies a certificate, a party may not appeal the denial but may seek a certificate from the court of appeals under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22.

Rule 11, Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings.

A certificate of appealability may issue "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). Courts must either issue a certificate

of appealability indicating which issues satisfy the required showing or provide reasons why such a certificate should not issue. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(3); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b); *In re Certificates of Appealability*, 106 F.3d 1306, 1307 (6th Cir. 1997). To receive a certificate of appealability, “a petitioner must show that reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003) (internal quotes and citations omitted).

The Court now concludes that reasonable jurists could not debate whether (1) the Court erred when it denied his motion to suppress evidence; (2) the petitioner received ineffective assistance of counsel; and (3) the guilty plea was defective because the Court did not comply with Rule 11 by not advising the petitioner of the nature of the charge.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the petitioner’s motion for a certificate of appealability [dkt. #90] is **DENIED**.

s/David M. Lawson  
DAVID M. LAWSON  
United States District Judge

Dated: May 18, 2015

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing order was served upon each attorney or party of record herein by electronic means or first class U.S. mail on May 18, 2015.

s/Susan Pinkowski  
SUSAN PINKOWSKI